

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA

BILLINGS DIVISION

JOHN ROBERT DEMOS,

Cause No. CV 08-58-BLG-RFC-CSO

Petitioner,

vs.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

THE U.S.A., THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
THE TERRITORY OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent.

This matter is before the Court on a petition for writ of habeas corpus filed by Petitioner Demos, a Washington state prisoner proceeding pro se, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

28 U.S.C. § 2241(a) authorizes the federal district courts to grant writs of habeas corpus “within their respective jurisdictions.” This Court plainly lacks jurisdiction over the Petition. The motion to proceed in forma pauperis should be denied and the action should be dismissed.

Transfer to cure want of jurisdiction, see 28 U.S.C. § 1631, would not be in the interest of justice. See 28 U.S.C. § 1631. Demos has filed three previous actions in this Court, and he has filed more than 350 actions in other federal district courts. See United States Party/Case Index, <http://pacer.uspci.uscourts.gov> (Apr. 11, 2008).

Additionally, because jurisdiction is plainly lacking, any appeal from the District Court’s disposition would be taken in bad faith. For the same reason, a certificate of appealability is not warranted.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE / PAGE 1

Based on the foregoing, the Court enters the following:

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (doc. 2) should be DENIED because the action is frivolous.
2. The Petition (doc. 1) should be DISMISSED.
3. A Certificate of Appealability should be DENIED.
4. The District Court should CERTIFY that any appeal from its disposition would be taken in bad faith, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(4)(B).
5. The District Court should direct the Clerk to enter a judgment of dismissal.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION AND
CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Petitioner may serve and file written objections to this Findings and Recommendations within ten (10) business days of the date entered as indicated on the Notice of Electronic Filing. A district judge will make a de novo determination of those portions of the Findings and Recommendations to which objection is made. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Findings and Recommendations. Failure to timely file written objections may bar a de novo determination by the district judge.

Petitioner must immediately file a "Notice of Change of Address" if his mailing address changes while this action remains pending in this Court. Failure to do so may result in dismissal of his case without notice to him.

DATED this 14th day of April, 2008.

/s/ Carolyn S. Ostby
Carolyn S. Ostby
United States Magistrate Judge